

their professionalism, patriotism and willingness to ensure our Nation's security. I know colleagues join me in welcoming Major James Ewald, and thanking him for his service to our country.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in Elkhart, IN. On November 17, 1999, Sasezley Richardson, a 19-year-old black teenager was shot dead as he strolled back from a local mall with diapers for a friend's baby. The two men that shot Richardson said they shot the young man solely because of his race. The victim was black and the perpetrators of the crime were white. One of the shaven-headed suspects told police he was a member of the violent, white supremacist Aryan Brotherhood, while the other reportedly said he wanted to kill a black person in order to get in the group.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### 2003 FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to address this year's Federal budget deficit, which is now expected to exceed \$450 billion. This will be the largest Federal deficit on record.

This is a staggering \$680 billion increase from the \$236 billion budget surplus the Federal Government ran 3 years ago.

And who knows how much the true deficit may in fact be if, a few months from now, the projection increases again due to the ongoing costs of rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan. Reconstruction costs are now running \$4.8 billion per month, or \$58 billion annually, which is well above what we have budgeted.

According to the Concord Coalition, a nonpartisan group that advocates for balanced budgets, "The first six months of the 108th Congress were the most fiscally irresponsible in recent memory."

The members of this Chamber and the American public should know the simple truth: putting our economy back on track is even more difficult in the face of deficits of this magnitude.

And next year, the on-budget deficit will likely top \$600 billion.

In my 10-year career in the Senate, there has never been a greater need for fiscal discipline than there is now. The then-record \$290 billion deficit we faced in 1992 required some very tough choices to be made but the choices that lie ahead will be even harder.

It is incumbent on the President and the House and Senate leadership to prepare the country for those choices. Instead, the President and the Republican leadership in Congress have cut taxes with abandon while increasing spending at a rate faster than at any point during the past 10 years.

Discretionary spending increased by 13.1 percent between 2002 and 2001, and is expected to increase by 9.7 percent this year over 2002 levels. Much of that spending has been necessary to fight the war on terror, recover from the attacks of September 11, and improve our homeland security.

Nevertheless, such spending cannot be sustained if tax revenues plummet due to ill-timed tax cuts and a weakened economy. In fact, the Federal Government has now reached a point at which it could eliminate all non-defense discretionary spending and still not close the Federal budget deficit.

That would mean eliminating all Federal spending on roads, schools, law enforcement, disease research, and the environment, among thousands of other programs.

This structural imbalance between Federal revenues and outlays threatens to send us into a spiral of increasing debt and rapidly accelerating interest costs. As the Federal debt increases and public saving decreases, long-term interest rates will inevitably be pushed higher.

That not only increases the amount that the Federal Government must pay to finance its obligations but also raises the cost of putting a mortgage on your home or financing a new car purchase. A conservative estimate puts the increase in long-term interest rates due to the budget deficit at 0.4 percent.

An increase of that magnitude would add \$800 per year to the cost of a \$200,000 home mortgage, or more than the majority of American taxpayers will receive from the President's latest tax cut.

Yet what is perhaps more threatening is the negative economic impact of these growing deficits.

The hard truth is that even robust economic growth will not bring the budget back into balance. When preparing deficit projections, the CBO assumes average real GDP growth of 3.3 percent between now and 2008, which is well in excess of the 1.5 to 2 percent average growth of the past 3 years.

Such moderately strong growth would still leave us with more than \$2 trillion in cumulative deficits over the next decade. And this does take into account the true cost of the tax cuts without the sunsets and other budgetary gimmicks, which is likely to add \$1.8 trillion to those deficits if all existing tax cuts were extended.

These fiscal problems are not intractable, but they require bipartisan cooperation and real fiscal discipline, both of which have been in short supply of late.

One unfortunate consequence of the administration's approach to the recent tax cut has been a growing partisan divide between Democrats and Republicans on fiscal policy.

That stands in sharp contrast to the atmosphere when I entered the Senate in 1992. At that time a group of moderate Senators from both parties joined forces to rein in spending and hold the line on new tax cuts.

Those efforts came to fruition in 1998, when the first Federal budget surplus since the Johnson administration was recorded. Budget surpluses continued for an additional 2 years, coinciding with a period of robust economic growth.

During the 108th Congress, I have worked to rekindle that spirit of bipartisanship because I fear for the consequences of maintaining our current course.

This past January, I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator CHAFEE to freeze further cuts to the top income tax rates, a move which would save over \$150 billion over 10 years if enacted today.

During debate on the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution, I cosponsored an alternate budget resolution with Senators CARPER, CHAFEE, and LINCOLN. That alternate resolution would have brought the budget back into balance 4 years earlier than the resolution which passed the Senate, and was revenue-neutral over the 10-year budget window.

And yesterday I introduced legislation to upgrade our country's transportation and water infrastructure. Credit for this bill is due to Congressman OBERSTAR in the House, and I am pleased to introduce the Senate companion bill. This bill would create more than 2 million new jobs, at less than a tenth the cost of the latest tax cut.

Moreover, the \$34 billion cost of my bill is fully offset by closing Enron-related tax shelters, putting an end to corporate expatriation and extending customs user fees.

This type of targeted, revenue-neutral stimulus promises to create more jobs than the President's tax cut, without digging us deeper into debt, and is precisely the sort of fiscally responsible approach to jump-starting the economy that we need.

Just as the budget surpluses of the late 1990s had a positive ripple effect of increasing the feeling of economic certainty and security in this country, the current budget deficit is having a negative ripple effect and is contributing to the near-freeze on hiring and capital investment we are currently experiencing.

We must break this cycle with bipartisan leadership or we will face an even greater crisis in the years ahead. We cannot afford to burden future generations with the debt resulting from our

fiscal mismanagement, and we cannot afford to defer tough choices to future leaders.

#### CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT AND THE FCC

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of S. J. Res. 17, the resolution of disapproval introduced yesterday by Senator DORGAN and a bipartisan group of Senators who are very concerned about the media ownership rules issued recently by the Federal Communications Commission. When the FCC issued those rules, it ignored the public. It ignored hundreds of thousands of public comments, and it ignored the calls of elected representatives for more careful consideration of these issues that are crucial to the future of information and entertainment in our country.

Over the past several weeks, many Senators have been doing what the FCC failed to do: listening to the American people. What we have heard is not applause for the new rules but great disappointment, and even anger. The American people are outraged by these new media ownership rules. They do not want new media ownership rules that legitimize eliminating local community voices in exchange for homogenization and uniformity. They do not want fewer and fewer choices, and less and less local control.

Those of us who support this disapproval resolution under the Congressional Review Act want to right the wrong done by the FCC. We believe that the people, not powerful media conglomerates, ultimately own the airwaves. The will of the people must be reflected in the rules that govern media ownership in this country. The strong public support for this resolution is demonstrated by the fact that there are already 35 Senators, from both sides of the aisle, who have signed a petition to bring this matter to the floor, as the CRA contemplates. It is now clear that we will have a vote on this matter in the Senate in the next few months. That is good news for the public.

The FCC's rules threaten to undermine the diversity of voices in the television and newspaper industries, just as diversity in the radio industry has been diminished. In a marketplace limited by only these new rules, our major media outlets will begin to look and act like radio, with absentee owners, standardized programming, and less local news and community involvement.

Thanks to the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which loosened the ownership rules for radio, we have seen the future of media consolidation, and we know that it offers a lot more to big media companies than it does to consumers. In some cases, it can be downright dangerous. The five giant media conglomerates that already dominate the airwaves will expand their reach and further stifle localism and diversity.

By invoking the Congressional Review Act, Congress can wipe out these new rules altogether, and the FCC will have to go back and redraft them. We plan to make it clear that the new draft should include some of the positive proposals contained in the recent media bill sponsored by Senator Ted Stevens that passed out of the Commerce Committee. The CRA specifically contemplated that agencies may have to redo regulations required by court or congressional mandate. If this disapproval resolution is passed by the House and the Senate, the preexisting rules will again be in effect until the FCC goes back to the drawing board and promulgates new regulations that are not substantially similar to the rules that Congress has disapproved.

In promulgating these new rules, the FCC ignored its primary responsibility—to serve the public interest. But fortunately, the FCC doesn't have the final word here. The people do. It is our duty in the Congress to listen to the people and give voice to their concerns. By passing the resolution of disapproval, we will do just that. I want to thank the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, for his leadership and the other Senators from both sides of the aisle who are working on this. This is an important effort and I believe we will be successful in taking this action on behalf of the public interest.

#### PESTICIDE HARMONIZATION

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support of S. 1406, which is pesticide harmonization legislation. I join my colleague, Senator DORGAN, as an original cosponsor of this legislation. I would like to commend Senator DORGAN and his staff, the Montana Grain Growers, the National Association of Wheat Growers, and our Montana Department of Agriculture for their willingness to work out the gritty details of this bill. It has been a long and laborious negotiation process, but I believe we have come up with legislation that is better for the farmers of this country.

In my home State of Montana and many other Western and Midwestern States, we have faced a number of trade disputes between Canada and the United States. One of the most glaring discrepancies deals with pesticides. Chemicals that are sold for one price just across the border in Canada are sold at a considerably higher cost to American producers. Why does this happen you may ask? The EPA places strong regulations on chemicals used in the United States and therefore, the chemical companies believe they should hike up the prices to pay for their trouble.

The chemicals sold in Canada and the United States, in most cases, have the exact same chemical makeup. The same company manufactures them but often gives them a different name and nearly always prices the American

chemicals higher. The crops harvested at a lower production cost in Canada are now competing with American products. I am a strong believer in fair trade, but for free trade to actually occur, this problem must be addressed.

Currently, American farmers are facing a serious economic recession. Grain prices are the lowest they have been in a number of years and there does not appear to be a light at the end of the tunnel. Additionally, much of the West is looking at yet another year of drought. Also, fertilizer costs are skyrocketing with the ever-rising cost of natural gas. To top it all off, they are also being forced to pay twice as much for nearly the same chemicals as their foreign neighbors.

This bill would eliminate current obstacles and even the playing field for our farmers. The bill operates under a similar concept as the previous bills introduced, but many of the details have changed. The pesticide harmonization bill that is currently introduced, S. 332, had the States, not EPA, in charge of pesticide registrations. This new version has EPA in charge of the process. This eliminated some of the concerns of States, whose budgets would not allow these much-needed registrations to be completed. It also protects confidentiality of ingredients in the chemicals.

Our farmers and ranchers have been paying too much for their pesticides and chemicals for too long. From my years as a football referee, I learned everyone needs to follow the same rules to play the game. We need to make sure Canadian farmers and U.S. farmers are playing under the same rules. I believe this bill makes that happen. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this crucial issue to America's farmers and ranchers.

#### THANKING THE NATIONAL MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter addressed to Mr. Ron Davis of the National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, July 16, 2003.

Mr. RON DAVIS, President  
National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association. Under your outstanding leadership, the National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association strengthened the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps combat power, and ensured our military's buildup in Southwest Asia.

The MEBA swiftly activated more than 40 vessels of the Ready Reserve Force. Our nation's military, and thus our national security, is dependent upon the quick response of each MEBA member. Your members more than met the challenge and exceeded all expectations.